Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/605,488	BURKE, THOMAS R.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Srirama Channavajjala	2166
All Participants:	Status of Application: Alle	owed
(1) <u>Srirama Channavajjala</u> .	(3)	
(2) Edwin A Skoch II, Reg.No. 50,483.	(4)	
Date of Interview:	Time: <u>1-30 PM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	-
Part I.	•	
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1-36		
Prior art documents discussed: Hertzog et al. US Pub.No. 2003/0069874 and Smith et al. US P	ub.No. 2002/0083008	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		·
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	•	•
	·	
de-		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

A telephone was made to applicant's representative Attorney, Edwin A Skoch II, Reg.No. 50,483 about the potential amendment to the claims 1,3,6,13-15,18, cancel claims: 2,4-5,7-8,10-12,16-17,19-36, amendment to the specification at page 22, paragraph [0066-0067], amendment to the drawings as filed on 2/28/2007 "replacement sheet" fig 15A" attached as markup drawing in order to allow the case. The representative agreed with the Examiner's proposal and authorization has given for an Examiner's Amendment.

.